1 SCOPING AND INFORMATIONAL MEETING CROOKSTON - APRIL 27, 2016 - 6:00 P.M. 2 3 BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 4 AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE 5 In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC for a Certificate of Need for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota 7 PUC DOCKET NO: CN-13-473 8 In the Matter of the Application of North Dakota Pipeline Company, LLC for a Pipeline Routing Permit for the 9 Sandpiper Pipeline Project in Minnesota 10 PUC DOCKET NO: PPL-13-474 11 In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need for the 12 Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the 13 North Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border PUC DOCKET NO: CN-14-916 14 15 In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership for a Route Permit for the Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project in Minnesota from the North 16 Dakota Border to the Wisconsin Border 17 PUC DOCKET NO: PPL-15-137 18 19 Crookston Inn & Convention Center 20 2200 University Avenue Crookston, Minnesota 21 22 23 24 25 COURT REPORTER: Janet Shaddix Elling, RPR

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: All right. It's been our observation that there is no one -- we don't have any new people coming into the room so, with your permission, we'd like to get started. Is that okay? Okay.

All right. My name is Barb Tuckner, I work for a division called Management Analysis and Development, we're internal consultants to state government, and my role tonight is just to keep the process moving, make sure it's respectful, that kind of thing, and make sure people's voices are heard.

You've seen the agenda, it's posted in two places. We are officially closing the open house but we will reopen it at the end if you want to talk to agency folks and so forth.

And I guess I just want to welcome you and thank you for coming out on what should be a spring day, but it doesn't feel like it. But thanks for being here.

The process is that we're going to have a half-hour presentation just to get our heads around the whole topic once again. Some of the information is posted around the back of the room as well. And then what we're going to do is we're going to have an opportunity for public comment. So that, hence,

the green cards. So we will invite you to come up one at a time and speak.

And just know that one of the critical parts of this meeting is that we have a court reporter in the room and she will be reporting your messages verbatim as we go around. Is that right, Janet?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: All right. So Janet needs to be able to hear you, so at times we will run over with the microphone, and that might take a moment because my legs aren't 18 years old anymore, they just aren't.

So what we will do is we will move into the presentation, but before we do that I just wanted to cover some ground rules. These have worked for us elsewhere in the state. By the way, this is the third meeting, third scoping meeting out of 12. So we will be completing these in May. And the scoping meeting, essentially the purpose of this meeting is to help give us some feedback or give some feedback to the people that are going to be writing the environmental income -- help me.

MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Environmental impact statement.

SHADDIX & ASSOCIATES (952)888-7687 (800)952-0163

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Impact statement, the environmental impact statement. So to make sure that we've done our due diligence and we're covering and looking at all of the things that we should relative to this project.

So the ground rules are posted around the room so I'm going to read them off and then add some other comments to them.

The first of which is we already talked about submitting the comment form for scoping at this public meeting. So inside of your yellow packets there's many ways from Sunday to submit a public comment. You can do it tonight in person --

(Off the record.)

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Okay. So there are many ways in which you can submit a public comment. You can come up tonight with that green card. You can fill out the comment form inside your yellow packet and mail that in. Or you can go to the website and submit a comment.

And is there something I missed? Or you can meet one-on-one with Janet to do so, we've offered that as the open house has gone on.

The ground rules are pretty straightforward. We want mutual respect, courtesy,

and patience at this meeting tonight so that we can hear your thoughts. They're all critical as we enter into this environmental impact stage or EIS stage. So we really need to hear your thoughts about what needs to be covered in that statement. So, hence, the scoping meeting. You can come up and talk about whether or not you are for or against this project, that's fine, but what's really critical to us is to make sure we are hearing from you about what needs to be included in that statement, what needs to be studied.

We want to maintain an atmosphere where everyone feels comfortable and welcome regardless of their point of view. That's called democracy and we want to embrace that tonight.

Am I going in and out? Is this microphone going in and out? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: A little bit.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Okay. Let me try another one.

All right. Don't interrupt anyone while they're speaking. That's common courtesy. And also it's very hard for Janet to record what you're saying if that is going on. And we do want everybody's comments reported tonight.

No displays, signs, or banners that obstruct people's view. If you have one rolled up under your sleeve we're asking that you just keep that so that it doesn't obstruct other people's view.

Refrain from addressing the audience or asking for audience participation. Again, we're interested in your comments about the scoping of the impact statement. So that's the critical information we're looking for tonight.

We want you to turn off your cell phones or put them on stun, whatever that setting is, so that they don't disrupt the meeting. What is it? Stun? Vibrate. Right. You know what I meant. So we're asking that you manage that.

And then lastly we're going to time this, and that's my job as well. As you come up to speak we're going to give you five minutes to speak and we will count down the time for you as it goes on.

Okay?

But before we get into any of the comments, anything for the good of the order that we need to cover, about the space, whatever? We're good to go?

All right. Then anything I didn't cover,

Janet?

Okay. I'm going to turn it over to Jamie and she'll go through the presentation.

MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Good evening, everyone. I'm Jamie MacAlister, I'm the Environmental Review Manager for the Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis unit.

And we're here tonight for the scoping meeting for Line 3 and the Sandpiper pipelines.

They are two separate projects, but we are combining these meetings to better facilitate your comments on both of these projects.

A couple of housekeeping things before we get started. Hopefully you all received a yellow folder when you came in. And in that folder, most importantly, you should have a copy of the presentation, which is primarily important for the contact information on the last page. Keep that handy.

You should also have a comment form in there, as well as some additional information on how to submit a comment.

Some evaluation criteria that we will be using to review alternatives as we go forward in the

scoping process.

A preliminary table of contents for the EIS, the environmental impact statement, which I will likely refer to from here on out as the EIS.

And two maps. One showing the route alternatives and one showing the system alternatives that have been introduced to date for these projects.

So if you're missing any of that information, I encourage you to stop at the back table and they'll help you get what you need.

Again, if you would like to speak, please fill out a card, although it would appear that we'll have plenty of time to take people's comments.

Also, as we go forward, for Janet's sake, and Janet, I'm sorry you can't see me over here.

When you come up, please be sure to state and spell your name for the record, that would be helpful.

Otherwise Janet will have to remind you to do so.

So just keep that in mind when you come up.

And as you probably noticed if you were here earlier that we do have technical staff available to answer your questions from the DNR and the PCA, as well as the Public Utilities Commission. So if you have further questions that we can answer

for you after the formal comment session, we're happy to do that.

All right. There we go.

Okay. So let's just start off quickly with an overview of the regulatory framework here.

It's not very exciting, but it does sort of help put things in context here.

So the certificate of need is governed by Minnesota Statute 216B and then Minnesota Rule 7853. We have the routing rules, Minnesota Statute 216G, 7852. As well as the fact that these EISs for each project will be developed -- prepared according to Minnesota Rules 4410.

And after we get through the environmental impact statement phase there will be contested case hearings for the route and CN. And those will be presided over by an administrative law judge.

So the purpose of these scoping meetings is really to provide the public, agencies, tribes, and government the opportunity to help us identify issues and impacts that you would like to see us cover in the environmental impact statement, as well as to participate in the development of route and segment alternatives. And all of this will feed

into a final scope that will be prepared and given to the Public Utilities Commission to finalize.

So we have been out here for a couple of years for the Sandpiper project as well as for Line 3. There have been over 30 scoping meetings. There have already been contested case hearings for Sandpiper. And these are some of the primary issues that we've heard as we've been out here. We know that folks are really concerned about spills, groundwater and surface water resources, wild rice, tribal concerns, the decommissioning of Line 3, jobs and local economies and climate change.

So we've named some of our top items that we've been hearing as we've gone through this process and developed a draft scoping decision, and what we're here to find out is is there anything that we've overlooked that you feel that we need to get on this list for analysis.

So I'll just run you through quickly what the EIS process is going to be like here. So we are at the public information and scoping meetings.

Once we're through with this we will be developing a final scope to be approved by the Public Utilities

Commission. There will then be an EIS preparation notice issued, and that will start a 280-day clock

that we have to complete the preparation of the EISs.

Those will be released. There will be another opportunity for public meetings for the draft EIS. There will be a final. And the final will have a determination of adequacy before this process moves into contested case hearings. So that's likely, looking at the schedule, but we're at least a year out from that. But just so you know, there will be additional opportunities for public involvement.

So we have this EIS sitting out here and we have these permitting decisions and there are a lot of things that feed into the EIS. So we're taking public comments, we are working with our sister agencies, tribal governments, other interested parties, and we're developing this EIS.

And the EIS, in turn, informs the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, who ultimately makes the permitting decision. So the EIS is really critical because it does help the Public Utilities Commission make an informed decision on these projects.

And if you've been following these projects at all, you will know that there were a

number of system alternatives developed and those are shown on this map and will be evaluated, as well as all of the route alternatives that were proposed during the scoping meetings for Sandpiper and Line 3.

So, just quickly to go through the permitting schedule, we're not expecting the draft EIS until sometime in early 2017. And that could be later depending on the approval of the final scope. There will be the draft EIS public meetings in -- early in 2017, with a final expected in late spring. The adequacy determination. And then moving into the contested case hearings. And possibly a Commission decision on the route the end of 2017.

This is a very preliminary schedule.

There will be probably other procedural elements that will play into this. But for the time being this is how we would anticipate the schedule moving forward at this point.

So for you to comment this evening, you can comment here verbally, Janet will take your comments. You can submit a written comment form and leave that with us, we have a box in the back you can put that in. You're welcome to email your comments to me as well. And as I said, all of that

information is on the last page of your PowerPoint presentation, so hang onto that for future reference.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Critical note here. The comment period ends of May 26th. So as long as you get your comments to me by May 26th, they will all be entered into the record. And I will post everyone's comments in batches alphabetically, both on eDockets and on our website.

So, with that, I'm going to turn this over to Barb and we will start the formal comment session here.

We are going to quickly move the screen and take some of this stuff out of your way.

And, yes, I will be taking questions on clarity of anything that we've said based on process or the development of the EIS. If you have other questions that you would like to talk to any of us about, we will be here until 9:00 to answer your questions.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Okay. So if you'd indulge us for just five minutes, we have to get this monstrosity out of the way, change the set, and get ready for the public comments. So we have several people who are going to be doing that.

As I mentioned, the green cards were submitted as people submitted green cards to speak tonight. And I'm going to ask for your indulgence for one thing. There is a family here with young children, and while they're not at the top of the queue, if it's okay with you, I'd like to move them to the top of the queue. Because they have children and I don't know how long they can stay awake and so forth, if you're okay with that? And they didn't ask me, I offered. Is the group okay with that, let the young family go first? Okay.

All right. So what we will do is -- he's going to dive any second here, right?

So what we're going to do is we're going to -- I'm going to have you come up in the order in which you submitted, and we're going move Michael to the top of the queue. So, Michael, you can come up.

I've got to move this table here. Give us five minutes, I guess.

(Break.)

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: So Michael will be the first to come up. And he can take a seat right here in the front. And then the second person up is Craig, and the third person -- Craig -- help me, Craig.

1 MR. CRAIG BUNESS: Buness. 2 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Craig Buness. And then the third person is Willis Mattison. 3 4 So if they could place themselves in the 5 front of you -- yeah, your dad is going to come up. If you could place yourself in the front of the room 7 so we can go through these one at a time. 8 Michael, do you want to come on up? And 9 again, if you could state your name and spell it for 10 Janet? 11 MR. MICHAEL KNUDSON: You want me to sit 12 Face that way? here? 13 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Face Janet. 14 My name is Michael MR. MICHAEL KNUDSON: 15 Knudson, M-I-C-H-A-E-L, K-N-U-D-S-O-N. 16 And first, being a working parent, and 17 kids, you know, I don't have -- we don't have a lot 18 of time as community members to do a lot of research 19 on this. So what I could find today, there's a website called Line 9 Communities, and I believe it 20 21 was a young lady up in Canada that put this 22 together. So this is an oil pipeline awareness and 23 discussion. And I'm just going to read the first 24 chunk here. 25 Using data from Enbridge's own reports,

the Polaris Institute calculated that 804 spills occurred on Enbridge pipelines between 1999 and 2010. These spills released approximately 160,000 barrels of crude oil into the environment.

And I want to pose the question, you know, are Minnesota communities going to be next?

Second. The information here today and all the maps are wonderful. It shows us the route. But as I had mentioned to some of the folks up here, what it's missing is all the data that's already out there about our Minnesota environment. And I have this map here that I created today in GIS, and it identifies all the counties on the route. And I could add a lot more layers than this, but it identifies tribal lands, which are a concern, the biodiversity significance in Minnesota, and the high vulnerability of water aquifers. Let alone wild rice locations, which there are hundreds of them in these counties across this route.

Next I'm going to read an editorial that my wife wrote.

So, first and foremost, the pipeline is a support system to oil extraction by method of hydraulic fracturing from the Bakken fields in North Dakota. Climate change impacts are already

occurring in Minnesota and globally. As a citizenry, we should be focusing on curtailing such extraction instead of supporting it. Currently the oil and gas industry enjoys exclusions and exemptions to major federal environmental statutes intended to protect human health and the environment.

And there's a long list of acts here and you can look them up yourself.

As a result of this lack of oversight, human health, wildlife communities and the environment are being endangered. Until more thoughtful state regulations are enacted in North Dakota and until the petroleum industry at large is held accountable to remedy the negative impacts on human health and the environment, Minnesota should not put our human communities, land or water systems at risk of degradation.

The proposed preferred Sandpiper route poses threats not only to waterways and wetlands in Polk County here, which we're residents of, but along the entire route. While we're concerned about the pipeline crossing the Red River of the North, the Red Lake River water course, we're equally concerned about the route crossing the state's most

famous river, the Mississippi. The pristine headwaters area is valuable and a cherished natural resource to all residents in Minnesota and across the nation. The bounty of fresh water resources in northern Minnesota, including wild rice beds, lakes and rivers and fisheries, generates 7.2 billion annually. This doesn't include the tourism industry, which grosses close to 12 billion in sales. These are real and permanent jobs. We're concerned that multiple pipelines will be allowed to follow this corridor if approved, including the proposed replacement of Line 3. These pipelines threaten not only pristine ecosystems, but also human communities and economic livelihoods. Estimates predict that the Bakken oil boom is at or near peak production. MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: One minute.

MR. MICHAEL KNUDSON: Okay. Because productivity of shale wells declines rapidly, many new wells must be drilled just to maintain existing production levels. And this is not sustainable development.

And I'm going to stop there. If anybody wants this editorial, you can get ahold of me.

I'm going to end with a few questions

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

here, right? Is Minnesota aware of the goals of the Paris Climate Change Agreement? And does Sandpiper Pipeline, does this project work towards contributing to those goals? I would say no.

Does the Sandpiper Pipeline make a meaningful, long-term sustainable contribution to our economy? Would it lower energy prices for consumers? Does shipping crude oil across the sensitive Minnesota landscape increase America's or even Minnesota's energy security? Will Minnesota be taking a national leadership role on climate change through this project?

The Sandpiper Pipeline is all risk to
Minnesota and its residents with no reward for
Minnesota, the people of this state or our natural
resources.

And also on the social, cultural, psychological impacts that this is going to have on communities that are already living in displacement and poverty in much of these counties --

- MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: You're done.
- MR. MICHAEL KNUDSON: Okay. Thank you.
- MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you.
- All right. The next person up is Craig.
- MR. CRAIG BUNESS: Good evening. My name

is Craig Buness, B-U-N-E-S-S. And I'm chairman of
the Polk County Board.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Can you hold the
microphone, please?

MR. CRAIG BUNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: It's not working right now. Try this one.

MR. CRAIG BUNESS: There you go.

When this project first came forward a few years ago, and the Polk County commissioners realized that this is proposed to go across Polk County, we started looking at the pros and the cons, the safety issues, the impacts on our citizens, the land.

And since we came to the decision to support this. And we did get some working with Enbridge, we got some of our key questions and concerns answered in a positive way. You're not going to get them all, we understand that.

And when you start to look at how you move product, and you look at Polk County, either the rail follows Highway 2, or the trucks that follow Highway 2 goes through the three major cities in Polk County, along with some other minor cities.

It goes by wetlands. It goes by the water.

Streams, rivers. And you start to look at what's the safest way to transport this.

I'm old enough to remember the oil embargo of 1973. And I remember the Sundays going to buy gas, they were allocated, and in my opinion there's a reason we're paying \$1.85 a gallon. It's because of what's happening out West. It's keeping some of the other -- OPEC honest.

So when you look at what we're trying to do as a county board, and you're trying to look at everybody, and you're not going to be able to make everybody happy, it's one of these -- I'm not comfortable with these meetings because it tends to be all or nothing. That's it. There's not a lot of compromising. And that's unfortunate.

In our business we tend to try and find compromise so it works a little bit for everybody. It may not be ideal or perfect, but you can eat it. And unfortunately in here that's probably not the case. It's all or nothing, thumbs up or thumbs down.

We've got other issues that impact Polk County. The farming. We've got 63 percent of our tax base is agricultural. With the railroads tied

up hauling oil, other products, we're having difficulty getting our fertilizers in in a timely manner. We're having difficulty getting our crops out to market just because of the railroads. There's not going to be a huge amount of new track and new rails. I don't see that happening at this point in time. So a better utilization, if we could put it out north of town here and pump it underground at four miles per hour, and nobody even knows it's there. To me, until somebody comes up with a better answer as to how we can get that oil from point A to point B, I'm certainly, and our board is willing to listen. Up to now we haven't heard anything.

An issue that we do have again as county commissioners, when you look at the fact that -- you talk about decommissioned lines. Whose problem is it going to be down the road? And I do hope that at some point somebody addresses this so that you can't leave something and abandon it and take off.

Because we're doing some of these things for generations that aren't even born at this point in time and I don't want to leave them with a problem about worrying about abandoned lines and the issues that come with that.

1 I've got some things here that I want to submit to you. I've got letters from six counties, 2 all five commissioners are in support of that. I've 3 4 got a letter from Minnesota Rural Community Caucus, 5 which Polk County happens to be a member, there's 29 of them in the state, there's a letter of support for this here. And we have a letter to the PUC from 7 Polk County. 8 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: 9 You've got a 10 minute. MR. CRAIG BUNESS: And we end up -- we've 11 12 got a letter to the editor that we, like I say, I 13 forget the date on it here, it's not fresh, but it's in support of this. So we do urge that you support 14 15 This letter is from June of last year. And I this. 16 want to turn those in to you for the comments. 17 So, anyway, that's all I have. 18 appreciate the time. 19 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you, Craig. 20 Thank you very much, Craig. 21 Next up we have Willis Mattison. Willis, 22 if you could state your name and spell it for the 23 court reporter. 24 MR. WILLIS MATTISON: Thank you.

My name is Willis Mattison, W-I-L-L-I-S,

M-A-T-T-I-S-O-N. You don't hear the I when you pronounce my last name, Mattison.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Sorry.

MR. WILLIS MATTISON: That's okay, you had no way of knowing.

First of all, I want to thank the

Department of Commerce, the Pollution Control Agency
and the Department of Natural Resources for a
significant change in format of the meeting that is
much more user-friendly.

The previous two years of meetings here were rather formidable and somewhat oppressive, having a phalanx of company officials sitting in front of the room glaring at a would-be testifier. It was very much intimidating and this is a lot better. So thank you for doing that. It's helpful.

We are here two years down range. And there are many people who have become efficient with the process believing that it is obstructionists and objectionists and opponents who have caused the delay. And I need to clarify that for the record.

From the very first day, citizens indicated that an environmental impact statement was the only instrument that was necessary or appropriate for a project of this scale with the

never see another large industrial facility with as large a footprint transporting as large a quantity of hazardous materials through its most sensitive portions of the state as this project.

An environmental impact statement is the necessary instrument, yet for two years there was resistance until ultimately citizens filed a lawsuit and the courts agreed with citizens. So here we are starting over.

There's a major flaw in the assumption of the beginning of the EIS that biases and prejudices the remainder of the document. And I'll read right from your scoping document. The statement of purpose, the purpose of the project is to transport growing crude oil production from the Bakken formation in North Dakota to Superior, Wisconsin terminal and then connect the various pipelines expanding access to refinery markets in the U.S. Midwest, and beyond.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: You have three minutes.

MR. WILLIS MATTISON: This statement of purpose is right out of the Applicant's application.

Under MEPA it is the RGU's responsibility to state

the purpose of the project because the Applicant is very likely to state the purpose in a biased way that favors their particular version of the project.

It's clear to everyone that the oil is in North Dakota and the refineries and pipeline hubs are in the Midwest near Chicago.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: I think someone is running for help. Why don't you try this one. Trickery, I think.

MR. WILLIS MATTISON: All right. Thank you.

Now, it doesn't take much imagination to realize that if you draw a line from Tioga, North Dakota to Patoka, Illinois you don't go through Superior, Wisconsin.

Your EAW proposes to consider truck and train as alternatives. To point out the absurdity of this purpose statement, my nephew is a truck driver right up here out of Warren. And if I called him up and asked him to haul oil from Tioga, North Dakota to Patoka, Illinois, he would look at the highway map and say there's a shorter way to get there than going through Superior.

If you call Burlington Northern and ask them to put the oil on a train, do you think they

would take the route through Superior and then south? No. They'd go across country.

Yet your document proposes to evaluate hauling oil to Superior, Wisconsin. That's inappropriate and out of keeping with MEPA.

You also limit the scale of alternatives when you route it through there. Because several of the alternatives on the map behind me will disappear if they're limited by that scope, since some of them don't go through to Superior, Wisconsin.

Those that go down near the Twin Cities and loop back up are rather ridiculous routes, but were routed that way because they were told they had to go to Superior rather than take the oil to Chicago.

You've also segmented the project in that part that lies within the state of Minnesota, when the entire project is over 600 miles, at least, from Tioga to Superior, and the oil does not stop there, it goes on to Chicago by pipelines, which will likely have to be expanded or approved or somehow changed to accommodate this extra oil. So your project actually goes entirely to somewhere near Patoka, Illinois.

To review it only as Minnesota severely

1 limits any and all of the alternatives that might follow alternative routes that have lesser impacts. 2 Some of my time was usurped by equipment 3 4 problems, if you'll be a little bit generous for me. 5 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: I'll give you 15 6 seconds. MR. WILLIS MATTISON: 7 You're more of a tyrant that Janet was the last time. 8 9 So I fully understand the possibility of 10 the jobs and economic benefits here, but Minnesotans 11 deserve a fair shot at looking at different ways to 12 skin this cat. 13 Most of the citizens are not opposed to 14 the pipeline project so it's not a black and white, 15 and I'm sorry that the Polk County Commission 16 Chairman got that impression. Most of the citizens 17 advocate for a pipeline through a safe route, and 18 the documents you have right now is not scoped to consider the reasonable safe routes. 19 20 Thank you. 21 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you. Thank 22 you very much. 23 All right. The next person up is 24 Christine Kiel. Did I get that right? Christian? 25 MR. CHRISTIAN KIEL: Christian Kiel, yep.

1 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Christian Kiel. MR. CHRISTIAN KIEL: C-H-R-I-S-T-I-A-N, 2 3 K-I-E-L. 4 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: I'll give you five 5 minutes and I'll let you know when you have three minutes left and so forth. 6 7 MR. CHRISTIAN KIEL: I just want to reiterate Mr. Buness' comments. Find the safest 8 9 alternative besides trucking and rail. The pipeline 10 seems to me to be the best way given today's 11 technology. 12 I haven't done a ton of research into the 13 safety of it, and I am concerned about the safety 14 environmentally. But we've been using pipelines for 15 years and, yeah, there have been leaks, but there 16 also have been -- they've also transported a lot of 17 products, both gas and oil. 18 So I guess, with that, I just, like I 19 said, I'd like to reiterate Craig Buness' comments 20 and I think that's the only way to go. 21 As far as alternative routes, I would 22 think that the company would know the best way to 23 route it in the most efficient way, trust their 24 knowledge, but that's why we're here, I guess, and 25 we'll find out the best way.

1	So I'm done.
2	MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: All right. Thank
3	you so much, Christian.
4	The next person up is Mario LaPlante. Is
5	Mario here? You are Mario, or you are not?
6	MR. MARIO LAPLANTE: I am Mario.
7	MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Oh. All right.
8	Fine.
9	MR. MARIO LAPLANTE: M-A-R-I-O,
10	L-A-P-L-A-N-T-E.
11	MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you. I'll
12	give you a three-minute warning.
13	MR. MARIO LAPLANTE: My concerns are the
14	long-term impacts, both economic and environmental
15	associated with leaving unused, unneeded pipelines,
16	in the ground for an indefinite and as of now an
17	undetermined period of time.
18	While the EIS addressed these issues, how
19	many miles of decommissioned pipelines are there in
20	Minnesota right now?
21	Working?
22	Okay. Is anybody from Enbridge here who
23	could answer that?
24	MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: I think we can
25	direct you can direct that question to them after

this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

MR. MARIO LAPLANTE: Okay. So how many miles of decommissioned pipelines are in Minnesota right now? How long have they been unused? what problems have been associated with their existence? While in use, the weight and heat of the oil keep movement from frost and buoyancy in check. Without those factors, what will keep the pipelines from being forced to the surface eventually? that happens, who will be responsible and what will be the landowner's recourse to get the problem corrected in a timely manner? Does the state of Minnesota have rules and regulations in place dealing with decommissioned pipelines? Why are they not required to be removed after they are no longer being used?

While they are in service, the argument can be made that they serve the public good and therefore are allowed to usurp landowner rights. After decommissioning, that argument is no longer valid and the land should be returned to the landowner unencumbered by the existence of the pipeline and the hazards and economic loss the pipeline represents.

At some point in time, someone will have

to deal with the cost of removing abandoned pipelines. That time should be now and it should be assumed by the consumers who demand energy and the corporations profiting currently from its transportation and not future generations and not the taxpayers of Minnesota. There is no time better than the present to deal with these issues.

The stakes are high, the need is current, the attention should be focused on legislatively requiring the removal of decommissioned pipelines before any new certificate of need or route permits are granted.

It's easy to say out of sight, out of mind, but once this thing is permitted in, who is going to care about the need for recovering abandoned pipelines? Right now it's a hot topic because they want this pipeline. So now is the time to press the issue. Like I say, they are generating revenue from this, funds could be set aside if the consumers can't pay for it and it's really not needed. The consumers using the oil should be paying the total cost of this transportation method.

That's all I've got.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: All right. Thank you very much, Mario. If you have a written

document you can share with Janet -- you already have done so, great. Thank you.

The next person up is Joan Lee. Joan?

MS. JOAN LEE: There is music on.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Yeah, the music is on now. I thought it was somebody's phone. We'll see what we can do. We'll just speak up, okay?

MS. JOAN LEE: Okay.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: If you could state your name and spell it for Janet, that would be great.

MS. JOAN LEE: Good evening. My name is Joan Lee, J-O-A-N, L-E-E.

Normally I wear a lot of hats every day of my life, but tonight the hat that I'm going to be wearing is as an organic farmer.

My husband and I have an organic farm north of Macintosh. The current pipeline runs through our property. We've had no issues with Enbridge. They had a repair that they had to do approximately three years ago. They knew what, as an organic farmer, how important our certification was to us. They did everything that they could to help to make sure that we did not lose our organic certification.

As an organic farmer you'd think that we'd be against this. You know, because if there's anything that happens, I mean, it's our livelihood.

As a farmer we have no fear of the land -- of the pipeline that's in our property right now, and the

pipeline that's proposed to run along side of it.

As a farmer I've seen Minnesota farms have lost over \$100 million because of crops that have had to stay in the field, not being harvested, because there's been no transportation for them. Or I've seen crops that have been harvested and that have been piled outside and are eventually ruined from the weather.

Environmentally, there have been many checkpoints that have been made on our farm. With plants, the bats, you know, they've all -- all these environmental impacts have been done on our property. There has been no issue.

We have water that runs through our land.

We have no problem with having a pipeline running

next to that water.

As a Minnesotan, I appreciate the other energy sources we have. Solar, wind, nuclear. But currently our state, and even as our nation, our infrastructure is not prepared to cut off our usage

of oil. In years to come, you know, it's possible that that usage will decrease. But right now we have to be concerned of how we can do our things now.

And, you know, you can look at that both ways, saying, well, you know, we have to be concerned of our future too. But I think about, I raised our three children on our farm, and that's the land that we raised the food that I fed my family on. We drink the water out of our well on our farm. We breathe the air. And for us we have total confidence and, as I mentioned before, no fear in this.

And I hope Minnesota can look at the business climate that they are creating, which maybe is not business friendly. We need to figure out a way that we can increase our economic backbone in this state and provide jobs and be able to provide a job to a family where the husband can come home at night versus having to travel miles away and spend a weekend -- or only be able to spend the weekend with his family because he's not able to work on a pipeline that's close to his home.

So I hope that through everything the issues can be taken care of and that in the long run

the best will be done that can be done for this project.

Thank you.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you, Joan.

The last person I have a green card for is -- oop, there's another one.

MR. ERWIN RUD: I'll help you out.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: State your name and spell it for the court reporter, please.

MR. ERWIN RUD: My first name is Erwin, E-R-W-I-N, nickname Erv, E-R-V, and the last name is Rud, R-U-D. I'm from Fosston. I'm a candidate for DFL endorsement on the DFL side, so I have a little bit of danger by even appearing here, perhaps. But you know what, I live dangerously and I like it, so I've got that.

With this, the chairman of the Polk
County Board says all or nothing. And, yeah, I
could see that. I don't quite see it that way. We
know that it's a pragmatic project that's involving
getting heating energy to the area, much of which is
needed by people to heat their homes and drive their
tractors and get to and from work, so there is that.

And yet I was grilled quite profoundly by a young fellow from Ruskin who I contacted to get endorsement, a 21-year-old guy that talked about the environmental issues, and I was impressed and proud of the fact on how he had grilled me.

And, you know what? These are the people that are going to being taking over the world and the country, and they have a right to be concerned what happens here and what happens in the aquarium, if you're not so religious minded, some people aren't.

As a background of this, when I was going to going to school at Morris State College back in -- a long time ago, I'll let it go at that. I worked on a pipeline the original time it was going through and I worked over by Solway. And I remember one time we had a guy that came through with a roller unit that checked the joints. It was me and my partner that would wrap tape around the joints, welded joints. And I had these leather gloves on, and I remember between my thumb and my forefinger how my hand got raw from rolling this tape around, you had to go over the top and catch it at the bottom time after time, and we had an inspector that came through. And there was one joint that he

called us back to, and I tell you what, he kind of ticked me off a little bit, because we rewrapped that joint four or five times, and finally on the fifth time I think we were getting ready to kill him. Finally he passed it.

But the point that I'm going to get to rather quickly, though, after that, is that I understand that 10 percent of the property taxes -- and this is for the commissioner -- 10 percent of the property taxes of the county, of Polk County, would go to taxes in the -- raising taxes in the county. And I would suggest to the commissioner, and this is the all or nothing in getting into green energy for my young friend from Ruskin that challenged me, is that we look at perhaps half of that be invested in green energy like solar panels for public buildings in the county and schools and that. And after those are fully invested to be able to save energy there, we maybe look at that as going to the lower-income households.

I would also challenge Enbridge Energy to possibly do that too. So, you know what, I have one minute left and I'm going to be proud to see that's my point.

Thank you.

1 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Thank you very 2 much. 3 I have Mike, is it Boucher? MR. MIKE BOUCHER: 4 Boucher. 5 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: State your name and 6 spell it for the court reporter. 7 MR. MIKE BOUCHER: Mike Boucher, B-0-U-C-H-E-R. 8 9 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: I'll let you know 10 when you hit three minutes. 11 MR. MIKE BOUCHER: Okay. I quess I'm up 12 here wearing two hats. Number one, I am the clerk 13 of Lowell Township, just north of town, that the 14 proposed pipeline will be crossing all six miles of 15 our township, and we as a township board have no 16 problems with the pipeline coming through. 17 just going to parallel the existing Line 81 that's 18 been there since 1961. So we've had the pipeline 19 there for 45 years and there have been zero issues 20 that I know of in this area. 21 And my second hat that I'm wearing is a 22 farmland owner. We have several pieces of land that 23 the pipeline crosses. Approximately three years 24 ago, they did two repairs on our land and Enbridge 25 was a great company to work with. They gave us

plenty of notice ahead of time, marked out where they were going to have to dig. They worked around our schedule with the farming. In fact, they delayed their repair a couple weeks so we could finish our harvest and get the crops out of the way so they would not damage it. So I can't say enough about their public relations and their ease to work with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I just feel that pipelines in general are the safest way of transporting oil long distances. Yes, they're expensive to install, but over the long term, 50, 60 years, the lifespan of the pipeline, it is way more efficient than trucking oil that far or If you want a fossil fuel that a truck by rail. would burn or a train would burn shipping it that far year after year after year, pipelines are far more efficient. Plus you risk the risks of a train derailment, a truck accident that could spill oil. Seems like every couple months on the news you hear of a train derailment in either Minnesota or North Dakota and luckily there haven't been any major ruptures of an oil tanker, but that could always happen.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Three minutes.

MR. MIKE BOUCHER: And also the train

cars could be better used to transport our crops, harvested crops off the field in the fall. Instead, those cars are -- or trains are being tied up shipping oil constantly. Meanwhile, our elevators wait for cars and it drives our basis up so we're losing approximately 28 to 30 cents per bushel on our harvested crop as far as wheat or corn or soybeans.

And, also, as a sugar producer, the lack of train cars has affected our beet payments quite a bit. American Crystal is the process of building a \$40 million sugar dome in Chicago just so we could transport our sugar there in the off-season and store it to have to our customers because rail cars are not readily available when you need them. So that \$40 million comes off the bottom line of all the sugar growers in this area.

So I guess I'm just in favor of the pipeline. And I just, again, I think it's definitely the safest and most efficient way to transport oil.

MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: All right. Thank you very much.

We have no more green cards. So out of curtesy to the group, is there another green card

1 wannabe out there that would like to speak? If not, what we can promise is that we 2 will be opening the open house and you can talk to 3 4 some of the technical experts from the DNR and the PCA and DOC. 5 And Janet is available to take comments, 6 7 one-on-one comments from you, if you so choose. And we will be around here to answer any 8 of your questions. Okay? 9 10 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Until 9:00. 11 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Until later. 12 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Until 9:00. 13 MS. BARBARA TUCKNER: Until 9:00. We'11 14 be here till 9:00 because she said so. So we will 15 be here till 9:00. If you have some questions, 16 we'll be happy to hang around and talk with you. 17 Thanks to all of you for coming out 18 tonight, and thank you for putting up with technical 19 issues with these and with that and so forth. 20 Again, your public comments are due by 21 And you know the myriad of ways at which Mav 26th. 22 you can get them to us and we hope you do. 23 Thank you very much and have a good 24 evening. 25 (Meeting concluded.)